

DRAFT
**Otay River Watershed Management Plan (WMP) and Special Area
Management Plan (SAMP) - Working Group Meeting Summary**

February 2, 2005, 6:30 p.m.
John Lippitt Public Works Center
1800 Maxwell Road in Chula Vista

Attendees:

Aspen Environmental: Michelle Mattson
Bureau of Land Management: Janaye Byergo
California Native Plant Society: Cindy Burrascano
Citizens: Theresa Acerro
City of Chula Vista: Josie Gabriel, Khosro Aminpour
City of San Diego: Rick Fox, Bob Collins
County of San Diego: Trish Boaz (DPLU), Tom Oberbauer (DPLU), Cheryl Monzon (DPLU), Bethany Yamanaka (DPLU)
County of San Diego Office of Supervisor Greg Cox: Erik Caldwell
EDAW: Meredith Speicher
McMillin Co.: Todd Galarneau
Otay Valley Regional Park Citizen's Advisory Committee: John Willett, Wayne Dickey
RBF Consulting: Marc Schulte
San Diego Audubon Society: Jim Peugh
San Diego Gas and Electric: Beverly Blessent
San Diego National Wildlife Refuge: Victoria Touchstone
SDRWQCB: Bruce Posthumus
Wildlands Inc.: Mark Tucker
Nancy Hughes (Facilitator)

Handouts:

- Revised Outline of the Otay River Watershed Management Plan
- Working Group Otay River Watershed Management Plan Goals and Objectives

1. Call to Order

Introductions were made

January 5, 2005 Meeting Summary is posted online and was approved by the Group.

2. Consultant Report

Michelle Mattson of Aspen Environmental gave a report on the Otay River Watershed; Planning and Permitting through the Watershed Management Plan and Special Area Management Plan.

Michelle Mattson stated that the County of San Diego and SANDAG population, housing and workplace projections are different. The WMP and SAMP are complementary plans in which the WMP provides management strategies and the SAMP provides comprehensive aquatic resource regulation and planning.

The SAMP components include the Planning Principles Document which describes opportunities and constraints analysis for each sub basin, sub basin specific BMPs to protect aquatic resources and a foundation for developing and evaluating project alternatives.

Bruce Posthumus stated that the RWQCB is not involved with the SAMP because there are not enough resources in order to do so.

A SAMP has not yet been completed in California. There are others in the process.

Tom Oberbauer stated that the Army Corps of Engineers supports the SAMP process but that uncertainties exist in the SAMP process especially because there has not yet been a completed SAMP in California.

Michelle Mattson stated that the SAMP is trying to fill the gaps left by the MSCP in aquatic resources take permits. Although the MSCP did research on mitigation strategies in aquatic resources, take permits are lacking.

Jim Peugh asked who would fund the maintenance in perpetuity.

Tom Oberbauer answered that the SAMP will be treated similar to the MSCP and areas in the preserve must be maintained through perpetuity. There are assurances for this. There will be a shared responsibility for maintaining perpetuity.

Jim Peugh asked what would happen to aquatic resources that are not of the highest quality after streamlining takes place under the SAMP.

Michelle Mattson stated that the plan would comply with the no net loss in aquatic resources policy. The plan will account for loss of some resources by improving and restoring to increase value to other resources. There is uncertainty as to exactly how this process will work.

Trish Boaz stated that the plan would go through CEQA/NEPA review in order to work out uncertainties before allowing permit certification.

Jim Peugh stated that he was concerned about mitigation programs due to a possibility that they would not take place or would be ineffective and not protect aquatic resources.

Michelle Mattson stated that mitigation is beginning to change. A watershed based approach is beneficial because holistic analysis of the watershed allows for the counteraction of the loss of the project by project mitigation approach.

Jim Peugh expressed concern that the ACOE will be under pressure to not fully comply with mitigation requirements.

Tom Oberbauer stated that the plan will provide for more consistency than a project by project mitigation approach currently being implemented.

Jim Peugh stated that he is interested in specificity in this plan.

Mark Tucker asked about the role of mitigation banks within the SAMP.

Tom Oberbauer answered that there will be a role of mitigation banks because there is not much land with wetlands within the SAMP.

Mark Tucker asked whether the County of San Diego will run in lieu fees for restoration, mitigation opportunities that compete with mitigation banks.

Tom Oberbauer answered that these detailed questions are still to be worked out in the process. The County of San Diego does not provide mitigation banks for developers.

Bruce Posthumus stated that aquatic resources are defined as within the jurisdiction of the ACOE.

Todd Galarneau asked how permitting will work within differing jurisdictions.

Michelle Mattson stated that layers are tools to identify the quality of resources and develop alternatives to development and activity.

The SAMP provides for the gaps in protecting aquatic resources. The goal is to benefit aquatic resources on a watershed scale that will limit cumulative impacts.

3. Project Director Reports

Trish Boaz thanked the participants of the Otay River Watershed Tour.

There is a revised schedule of deliverables posted online.

The web information tool will be demonstrated by TAIC at next month's meeting.

4. **Discussion Items: Draft Watershed Management Plan Goals and Objectives**

Facilitator Nancy Hughes conducted group activities and reviewed the Watershed Management Plan Goals and Objectives. The Group reviewed each goal and objective and moved toward streamlining. The Goals and Objectives were broken down into goals, objectives and actions.

5. **Next Project Team/Working Group meeting Wednesday March 2, 2005**

6. **Upcoming Events/Public Announcements**

Trish Boaz announced that she will be giving a presentation on the Otay River Watershed to the SANDAG Borders Committee on Friday March 18, 2005.

7. **Public Comment**

The Meeting was adjourned at 9:00pm